

FROM
Intellectual Property Group of
Pillsbury Winthrop LLP
Attorneys at Law
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102

Telephone: (703) 905-2000

Our Facsimile #: (703) 905-2500

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO: UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

FACSIMILE #: (703) 872-9306

No. Pages (Including this page) 8 FAX Opr: Theresa Togba

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE CLEARLY ALL PAGES, PLEASE CONTACT US IMMEDIATELY

By Telephone AT: (703) 905-2045 (local)
or (703) 905-2000 (local)

->->->

USPTO:

PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE CLEAR RECEIPT OF ALL PAGES INDICATED
ABOVE BY FAXING THIS PAGE BACK TO ONE OF OUR FACSIMILE
NUMBERS STATED ABOVE

In re PATENT APPLICATION of

Inventor(s) HORI ET AL.

Appln. No. 09/867,418

series code ↑ ↑ serial no.

Filed: May 31, 2001

Group Art Unit: 1743

Examiner: Alexander, Lyle

Atty. Dkt. PM 0281359

M#

TITLE: EVALUATION METHOD FOR
POLYCRYSTALLINE SILICON

Date: April 29, 2004

Name or type of signed paper being transmitted:

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION TRANSMITTAL; REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

MESSAGE:

(ATTN: Atty/Sec.: Transmit only one paper herewith. For papers not acceptable by fax, see back side or LAN
Forms Directory PAT-286 Rear. Do not file originals but fasten them in our file (left side) with
this sheet and fax receipt on top. Do NOT send the originals nor a confirmation copy to the PRO.)

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent
and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Name John P. Darling Sig. John P. Darling Date April 29, 2004
Reg. No. 44482

061063/0281359

C# / M#

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 29 2004
OFFICIAL

Attorney's Docket 061063-0281359
Client Reference: OSP-10476

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION of:
HORI ET AL.

Confirmation Number: 7533

Application No.: 09/867,418

Group Art Unit: 1743

Filed: May 31, 2001

Examiner: Alexander, Lyle

For: EVALUATION METHOD FOR POLYCRYSTALLINE SILICON

Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION TRANSMITTAL

Transmitted herewith is an amendment/response for this application.

FEES

The fee for claims and extension of time (37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17) has been calculated as shown below:


	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NO. PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE	ADDIT. FEE
TOTAL	20	-	20	= 0	\$ 18.00 = \$ 0.00
INDEP.	1	-	3	= 0	\$ 86.00 = \$ 0.00
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEP. CLAIM				+	\$ 290.00 = \$ 0.00
TOTAL ADDITIONAL CLAIM FEE					\$ 0.00
GRAND TOTAL					\$ 0.00

HORI ET AL. -- 09/867,418
Client/Matter: 061063-0281359

FEE PAYMENT

Authorization is hereby made to charge the amount of \$0.00 to Deposit Account No. 033975. Charge any additional fees required by this paper or credit any overpayment in the manner authorized above. A duplicate of this paper is attached.

Date: April 29, 2004
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000
Customer No. 00909


JOHN P. DARLING
Reg. No. 4448
Tel. No.: (703) 905-2045
Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER ART UNIT 1743**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION OF

Confirmation No.: 7533

HORI

Group Art Unit: 1743

Appln. No.: 09/867,418

Examiner: Alexander, Lyle

Filed: May 31, 2001

Title: EVALUATION METHOD FOR POLYCRYSTALLINE SILICON

April 29, 2004

* * * * *

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mail Stop After Final
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the Office Action dated January 29, 2004, reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Firstly, Applicants note that claim 20 has not been rejected, or treated on the merits. Applicants assume that claim 20 is allowable.

Secondly, it is respectfully submitted that the finality of the January 29, 2004 Office Action is improper and must be withdrawn. Claim 19 was rejected in the September 11, 2003 Office Action as anticipated by either Nakagawa et al. (U.S. Patent 6,429,035) or Japanese Publication No. 11-145230 (JP '230). No amendments were made to claim 19 in the Amendment filed November 5, 2003. However, in the January 29, 2004 Office Action, claim 19 was rejected as obvious over Nakagawa et al. in view of JP '230. Applicant's November 5, 2003 Amendment did not necessitate this new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, the finality of the January 29, 2004 Office Action is improper and must be withdrawn. As such, Applicants are entitled to entry of this response. See MPEP 706.07(e).

Claims 1-7, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Nakagawa et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.